*WORKING PAPER*

Working Paper No.26

# Inmigration to Madras Urban Agglomeration

by

Sarajit Majumdar
K.Nagaraj

**MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No.26

# Inmigration to Madras Urban Agglomeration

by

Sarajit Majumdar
K.Nagaraj

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,
Adyar, MADRAS 600 020

September, 1982

## Contents


| | Page No. |
|---|---|
| Section I : Introduction ... ... ... | 1 |
| Section II : Extent of Migration and the Role of migration in the Population Change in MC | 6 |
| Section III : Pattern of Migration into MUA | 13 |
| Section IV : Nature of Migration into MUA | 20 |
| Section V : Socio-economic characteristics of migrants in MUA | 25 |
| Section VI : Concluding Observations | 44 |
| Appendix I : Data | 49 |
| Appendix II : Mode of Migration | 58 |


*******

# List of Tables

| | | Page No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Percentage of male workers in total male workers in different economic activities in Census years since 1901 (Madras city) | 2 |
| 2. | Distribution of migrants and population and the extent of migration in MC and STs, 1971 | 7 |
| 3. | Number of migrants, total population and the extent of migration in MC in the Census years since 1901 | 8 |
| 4. | Decennial rates of growth (percentage) of total population natural population, the migrants and the contribution of migrants to total population change | 11 |
| 5. | Distribution of migrants in MC from various places of last residence by rural and urban areas, in 1971 | 14 |
| 6. | Percentage distribution of migrants in MC in 1971 by rural and urban areas of each place of last residence | 15 |
| 7. | Distribution of migrants in STs from various places of last residence by rural and urban areas in 1971 | 17 |
| 8. | Percentage distribution of migrants in STs by rural and urban areas in each place of last residence in 1971 | 18 |
| 9a. | Distribution of migrants in MUA by their rural/urban places of birth in 1971 | 22 |
| 9b. | Distribution of migrants in MUA by their rural/urban places of last residence in 1971 | 22 |
| 9c. | Step and return migration in MUA from Rural/urban places of last residence in 1971. | 22 |

| | | Page No. |
|---|---|---|
| 10. | Sex-wise workers' participation rates of migrants in MC, in 1971, from rural and urban last residece | 27 |
| 11. | Migrant and resident workers across economic activities in MC : 1971 | 29 |
| 12. | Percentage distribution of migrant workers in MC, in 1971, from rural and urban last residence across industrial activities | 31 |
| 13. | Sex-wise workers' participation rates of migrants in STs, in 1971, from rural and urban last residence and workers' participation rates of the total population | 33a |
| 14. | Percentage distribution of migrant workers in STs, in 1971, from rural and urban last residence across industrial activities | 37 |
| 15. | Sex-wise percentage distribution of migrants in MUA from various last residences across educational levels | 40 |
| 16. | Occupational distribution of the migrants in MUA at given educational levels, 1971 | 42 |
| I.1 | Nature of 1971 Census migration data and their possible use | 52-3 |
| I.2 | Estimates of total migrants in MUA/MC across different census migration tables, 1971 | 56 |
| II.1 | Sex-ratios of migrants of various marital statuses in MC, in 1971, from various places of last residence | 60 |
| II.2 | Distribution of 'never married' migrants and their sex-ratios by age groups in MC, 1971 | 61 |
| II.3 | Sex ratios of migrants in MC, in 1971, by rural and urban last residence | 63 |
| II.4 | Sex ratio of migrants in MC, over time, from different places of last residence | 66 |
| II.5 | Sex ratio of migrants in STs, in 1971, from various places of last residence across marital statuses | 69 |
| II.6 | Distribution of 'never married' migrants by sex and age groups in STs and their sex ratios, 1971 | 70 |
| II.7 | Sex ratios of the migrants in STs, in 1971 from rural and urban last residences. | 71 |

********

# Inmigration to Madras Urban Agglomeration*

## Introduction

This paper attempts to describe the data on net inmigration** to Madras City (MC) and the satellite towns (STs) of Madras Urban Agglomeration (MUA) available mainly from the Census 1971. For an intertemporal analysis of migration into MC we shall use the census migration data since 1901. Owing to the lack of time series data we have not attempted any intertemporal analysis of migration into the STs.[1] We shall analyse the migration data in the broad perspective of nature of urbanisation in MC and STs, where the nature of urbanisation is indicated by the pattern of growth of different economic activities in these urban areas. We shall, therefore, begin by a brief description of the nature of urbanisation.

## Nature of Urbanisation in MC and STs

Madras City during the 19th century was basically a city of 'trade and commerce' with scattered growth of factories at a small scale.[2] Census data in the 20th century suggest that Madras is a multifunctional city, ie., no economic activity accounts for 40 per cent or more of

---

* We are grateful to Prof.C.T.Kurien, U.Kalpagam and M.S.S.Pandian for their kind suggestions and help. We are also indebted to Dora Quadros, M.Selvam, M.Udayakumar, V.C.Naidu for painstaking collection of census data.

** Henceforward we shall refer to net inmigration as migration. The data to be analysed refer only to inmigration.

1. Since the urban agglomeration concept was introduced in 1971, the STs were included in MUA in that year. The STs are included in Chingleput district. The migration data before 1971 are given for all the towns of Chingleput together where STs of MUA are a part. Because of this clubbing of the data, it is not possible to find migration data for the STs alone. Hence intertemporal analysis for STs is avoided.

2. Census of India, 1961/<u>Madras City Report</u>, Vol.IX, Part X-(I), 1973. See also Lewandowski, Susan J, 'Changing Form and Function in the Ceremonial and the Colonial Port City in India: A Historical Analysis of Madurai and Madras', in Chaudhuri, K.N. and Dewey, C.J. (ed), <u>Economy and Society: Essays in Indian Economic and Social History</u>, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1979.

the total workers except for the heterogeneous misspecified activity, such as 'other services' in 1931 (Table 1). It can be seen from the table that from 1901 to 1931 'other services' remained a dominant activity. During the same period there was an overall decline in the employment prospects, as shown by the share of workers in an activity out of total workers, in 'manufacturing','trade and commerce' and the 'transport storage and communication' activities.

Table 1 : Percentage of Male Workers in Total Male Workers in Different Economic Activities in Census Years since 1901 (Madras City)

| Census years | Manufac-turing Activity | Trade and Commerce Activity | Transport, Storage and communication Activity | Other Services |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1901 | 27.5 | 17.0 | 14.4 | 31.2 |
| 1911 | 24.8 | 16.0 | 11.2 | 36.8 |
| 1921 | 21.7 | 19.0 | 10.2 | 38.8 |
| 1931 | 18.9 | 14.9 | 10.2 | 47.1 |
| 1951 | 24.2 | 23.0 | 11.1 | 34.3 |
| 1961 | 26.4 | 20.0 | 12.8 | 33.0 |
| 1971 | 27.3 | 25.3 | 19.5 | 19.8 |

Source: Mitra, A. et. al. (1980).

Information regarding the trend during 1931 and 1951 is not available from the census, but there is an evidence that the factories grew rather rapidly in MC during this period.[3]

---

3. Workforce figures for 1941 are not available from the Census. But it is reported that the number of factories grew from 141 to 350, in MC between 1939 and 1948. (See Census of India, op.cit. p.111).

From 1951 onwards, as the table suggests, there is an increase in the employment prospect in 'manufacturing', but closely followed by that in 'trade and commerce activity. That is, after 1951 MC grew with industrialisation but not quite uniquely, there was the growth of trade and commerce also in this period. On the basis of these information we can say very broadly for MC that 1901-31 is the first period of urbanisation where there was a decline in the employment prospects in the 'manufacturing', 'trade and commerce' and 'transport etc' activities. 1931-51 as the second period of urbanisation with rapid industrialisation; and 1951 onwards as the third period of urbanisation where 'manufacturing', 'trade and commerce' and 'transport etc' activities' employment prospect grew, perhaps moderately.

The year 1951 can be taken as a cut off point of another important event. Around 1951, or after independence, a good number of big industries came up in the satellite towns around the core city of Madras.[4] It has been indicated elsewhere that the growth of workforce in the manufacturing industries has contributed the most towards the growth of total workforce in the STs since 1961.[5] In a nutshell, the STs' urbanisation is mainly through industrialisation, perhaps beginning at a large scale in 1951. This corresponds to the third period of urbanisation in MC.

A comparison of the above suggests that while the nature of urbanisation in MC is nonunique, it is unique in the STs. Especially after 1951, MC continued to industrialise but it did not have a unique dominance, for there was a growth of 'trade and commerce' also.

-------------

4. Census of India, op. cit, p.116.
5. Nagaraj, K. and Majumdar, S. Growth of Madras Urban Agglomeration, Working Paper No.25, Madras Institute of Development Studies, 1982.

The Problem

Population in MC during 1951-61 grew at a decennial rate 22 per cent, and during 1961-71 at 43 per cent. In the satellite towns (STs) population grew at the rates 22 and 84 per cent in the respective decades 1951-61 and 1961-71. Population of the state of Tamil Nadu grew at 12 and 22 per cent in the respective decades. Since the population of MC and the STs grew at a much higher rate, in the comparable decades, than that of the state, there is a possibility of a high inflow of migrants to these areas. Also, since the growth rate of population was much higher in STs than in MC, it is possible that migration flow will be higher into the former towns than into the latter one. We intend to examine, therefore, the extent of migration into these places (MC & STs) and the role of migration in the population change in MC. These we shall examine in the light of the nature of urbanisation in MC and STs.

Urbanisation and migration into urban areas are interlinked. Urbanisation stretches its field of attraction across space -- across districts, states and even countries. But the influence of urbanisation varies across space depending upon several factors. For instance, cost of migration proportional to distance, differences in the employment and income opportunity between the origin and the destination, differences in the socio-economic environment across space etc., act as constraints on the volume of inmigration, given the process of urbanisation at a place. That is, the stresses and strains exerted by urbanisation and other factors determine the volume of migration across space. In this context, we shall examine the volume of migration into MC and STs from various places (states, districts, rural and urban areas etc), which we shall refer to as pattern of migration into MC and STs.

An issue related to the pattern of migration is that if nature of migration into MC and STs. Have the migrants moved to MC/Sts in one step or in several steps? This question may not be directly relevant in relation to the nature of urbanisation, but from the point of view as to who migrates in single or several steps the nature of migration becomes important. It is found that sometimes migrants move first to small towns and then to bigger cities and sometimes converse holds good. /Cormell et. al. 1976/. It is also possible that as urbanisation leads to higher population density in the big cities, first step migrants to these cities tend to settle at the smaller towns in the next move. There is yet another possibility. Persons may move from a place to another and come back to the original place, i.e., there can be return migration. Considering, therefore, that there can be several types of migratory movements we shall examine the nature of migration. That is, how did the migrants move into MC or STs? This question is often related to the characteristics of the migrants,

Finally, given the somewhat different nature of urbanisation in MC and STs, we shall examine as to who are the migrants or what are the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants. Are the migrants in MC and STs different sets of people in terms of their characteristics, such that the migration into these places is the result of different nature of urbanisation?

Our issues therefore, are summed up as the following:

1. Extent of migration into MC and STs, and the role of migration in the population change of MC (Section II).
2. Patterns of migration into MC and STs (Section III).
3. Nature of migration into MUA (Section IV).

4. Characteristics of the migrants in MC and STs (Section V).

5. In section VI we shall put forward the possible hypotheses that require further examination.

II

## Extent of Migration and the Role of Migration in the Population Change in MC

We have indicated earlier that MC and the STs of MUA show a possibility of different extent of migration. In this section we shall examine the extent of migration into MC and STs in 1971. Since the extent of migration is likely to be related to the nature of urbanisation over time we shall examine also the change in the extent of migration into MC since 1901. For the reasons stated earlier changes will not be analysed in the case of the STs.[6]

Extent of migration will be indicated by the percentage of migrants in the total population of MC and STs. The role of migration will be indicated by the percentage of net addition to migrants to the net addition to the total population. For the purpose of studying the extent of migration into MC and STs at a point of time we shall make use of 1971 Census Migration Table DV. This table gives reasonable estimates of the migrants in MUA and MC (see Appendix I). For an intertemporal analysis of the extent of migration and the role of migration in population change in MC we shall use the migration and population data available from the census 1961, which makes the data available since 1901.[7]

-----------

6. See footnote 1, Section I

7. Census of India, *op. cit.*

## Extent of Migration into MC and STs, 1971

Extent of migration in MC and STs, according to 1971 Census, are shown in Table 2 (col. 4). The table shows that despite a high concentration of migrants, the large population base of MC has resulted in a low extent of migration as compared to that in the STs. Small number

Table 2 : Distribution of migrants and population and the extent of migration in MC and STs, 1971

| Towns<br>(1) | No. of Migrants<br>(2) | Population<br>(3) | Percentage of Migrants in total population<br>(4) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Madras City (MC) | 7,86,545<br>(68.00) | 24,69,449<br>(78.00) | 32 |
| Satellite Towns (STs) | 3,77,265<br>(32.00) | 7,00,481<br>(22.00) | 54 |
| Total in MUA | 11,63,810<br>(100.00) | 31,69,930<br>(100.00) | 37 |

(Figures in the parantheses indicate percentage in column total)

of migrants on an even smaller base of population has given rise to a high extent of migration in STs. Late starters, as the STs are in terms of industrialisation, have had a very high rate of inmigration.

## Extent of Migration into MC Over Time

The extents of migration since 1901 are presented in Table 3. It can clearly be seen from the table that since

Table 3 : Number of migrants, total population and the extent of migration in MC in the census years since 1901

| Census years | 1901 | 1911 | 1921 | 1931 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Migrants | 1,60,623 | 1,73,344 | 1,76,500 | 2,25,225 |
| Population | 5,09,914 | 5,18,994 | 5,28,443 | 6.47.198 |
| Migrants/Population 100 | 31.5 | 33.5 | 33.4 | 34.8 |

| Census years | 1941 | 1951 | 1961 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Migrants | 3,22,011 | 5,74,425 | 6,42,828 | 7,86,545 |
| Population | 7,90,257 | 14,18,333 | 17,32,690 | 24,69,449 |
| Migrants/Population 100 | 40.7 | 40.5 | 37.1 | 32.0 |

1901 to 1931 the extent of migration remained almost stagnant. There was a sharp increase in the extent of 1941, stagnancy again in 1951 and a sharp decline thereafter. There was a huge wave of migration between 1931 and 1941 which had sharply raised the extent of migration in 1941. On the basis of the extent of migration the census years can be divided into three broad periods: 1901-31 as stagnancy in the extent of migration, 1931-51 increased extent of migration and 1951-71 declining extent of migration into MC.

These periods roughly correspond to different nature of urbanisation that took place in MC (See section I).

First period corresponds to the declining prospects of 'manufacturing' employment and increasing prospects of employment in 'other services' which includes often heterogeneous misspecified industrial categories. That is, in the period of declining industrial employment prospect the extent of migration stagnated. During the second period (1931-51), i.e., the period of fast industrialisation[8] the extent of migration increased sharply. During the third period of urbanisation, also when the new new industrial investment shifted away from MC to the STs[9] (1951 onwards), MC experienced a decline in the extent of migration.

The above observations are merely suggestive and non-rigorous. In fact, a hypothesis that the extent of migration (perhaps also the volume of migration) is positively related to the growth of manufacturing activity needs to be tested. Since we lack the data on industrial establishments at different census years we cannot test the hypothesis in the present paper.

However, a part of the explanation for the observed behaviour of the extent of migration could lie in the inaccurate birth and death statistics in MC before 1931.[10]

---

8. Madras city Report writes, "The growth of Madras City was found in many directions, in trade & commerce, in improved transport and communication and development of residential quarters..... Industrial growth has been marked after 1930. With the increase in the availability of power and the possibility of cheap labour, more and more industries were started around Madras City." See Census of India Op.Cit p.19. But according to our table in Section I, there is an indication of the growth in the trade and commerce activity along with manufacturing activity.

9. "One striking feature of the development is that big industries which have come up in the last ten years (prior to 1961) have been located outside the city (these locations are now in the satellite towns of MUA)." Census of India, Op. Cit. p.116.

10. See next page.

We do not know whether the inaccurate vital statistics overstate or understate the natural population which will have an impact on the figures for total population and thus on the extent of migration.

If the record of vital statistics has improved after 1931, the rise and decline in the extents of migration after 1931 are genuine. Therefore, the variations in the extent of migration since 1941 may be explained by the nature of urbanisation in MC and the STs.

The decline in the extent of migration after 1951 could be due to two factors. It could be partly due to the migration of people from MC to the STs where there can be a large number of migrants who came to MC earlier, and partly due to the decline in the rate of net inmigration to MC. This second aspect will be dealt with below in the role of migration in the population change of MC. As for the outmigration of people from MC to the STs census migration data of 1971 suggests that as many as 1.42 lakhs of people moved from MC to the STs. We do not know if this outmigration from MC started after 1951. But we shall try to see if this outmigration was a response to the industrialisation in the STs which started in a big scale only after 1951 (see Section V). The phenomenon of industrialisation in the STs after 1951 may justify the two factors noted here.

## Role of Migration in the Population Change in MC since 1901

As stated earlier, we shall indicate the role (contribution) of migration in the population change, over time, by the percentage of net addition to the number of migrants to the net addition to total population in MC. We shall also

---

10. M.W.M.Yeatts in 1931 notes, "In practice, however, Madras vital statistics are anything but above cavil..... Omissions are the most striking instance of weakness in the records..... The number of births is anything but an exact determination of actual facts...., deaths are less inaccurate but are far from absolute." Census of India, *Op. Cit*, p.47.

see if the rate of inmigration to MC has declined during the period of rapid industrialisation in the STs. However, in order to capture the changing contribution of migration to population we have presented the required rates of growth in Table 4.

Table 4 : Decennial Rates of Growth (Percentage) of Total Population, Natural Population, the Migrants and the contribution of Migrants to Total Population Change

| Years (1) | Decennial growth of total population (2) | Decennial growth of natural population (3) | Decennial growth of migrants (4) | Contribution of migration to population change (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1901-1911 | 1.78 | - 1.04 | 7.92 | 140.00 |
| 1911-1921 | 1.82 | 1.82 | 1.82 | 33.00 |
| 1921-1931 | 22.47 | 19.90 | 27.61 | 41.00 |
| 1931-1941 | 22.10 | 10.97 | 42.97 | 68.00 |
| 1941-1951 | 79.48 | 80.23 | 78.39 | 40.00 |
| 1951-1961 | 22.16 | 29.14 | 11.91 | 22.00 |
| 1961-1971 | 42.52 | 54.41 | 22.36 | 20.00 |

The table shows the contribution of migration in population change increased from the decade 1911-21 to the decade 1931-41, and thereafter it declined (col.5). During the period of increasing contribution the rate of growth of migrants increased at a much faster rate than the natural population. Thereafter the natural rate of growth of population was always far higher than that of the migrants, one important point is that during the rapid industrialisation

in MC (1931-41) the contribution increased sharply, and 1941-51 onwards it declined sharply. The sharp decline was partly due to the higher rate of growth of natural population since the decade 1941-51, reasons for which might be the more efficient record of the vital statistics.

As for the rate of inmigration we can see that from 1911 to 1951 it increased and then declined sharply from 1951 to 1971 (col. 4, Table 4). Though there was an increase in the rate of net inmigration during 1961-71, it remained far below the rates obtained during the decades 1921-31 to 1941-51. In other workds, in third period the rate of inmigration to MC declined during period when the industrialisation took place in the STs.

Summary of observations

1. During the decline in the prospects of 'manufacturing' employment (1901-31) the extent of migration into MC does not show any significant change. The extent of migration increased sharply in the period of industrialisation in MC (1931-51). After 1951, when industrial investment shifted away from MC to the STs the extent of migration declined sharply. These observations give rise to the hypothesis that the rate of inmigration to MC, or even to MUA, is positively associated with the pace of industrialisation in MC (or MUA). During the third period the rates of growth of migrants have declined in MC as compared to the period of industrialisation in MC.

2. In terms of 1971 census data the extent of migration is higher in the STs than in MC. About 1.42 lakh of persons moved out of MC to the STs.

Given the somewhat different nature of urbanisation in MC and the STs, if the migrants have responded to the nature of urbanisation in these areas migrants' concentration in the relevant economic activities and the related occupational pattern should be revealed in their characteristics. The migrants' characteristics will be described in Section V.

III

## Patterns of Migration into MUA

We shall now examine as to how far the types of urbanisation in MC and the STs have stretched their influence across space, i.e., beyond the district, state and even beyond the country. In other words, we study the magnitudes of migration from various places of last residence, i.e., from other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA,[11] from other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu and from other countries outside India. Migration from these places of last residence will be termed respectively as interdistrict, interstate and international patterns of migration into MC and the STs. These patterns will be further broken down into rural-urban and urban-urban patterns of migration. The first terms (rural and urban) of these patterns refer to the rural/urban nature of the last residences. In the case of migration from MC to STs and the converse, we shall refer to them as the intra-agglomeration migration.

For this purpose we shall use the data on total migrants available from the Census Migration Table DV, for this table gives the reasonable estimates of the number of migrants with all possible disaggregations (See Appendix I). Since the data are available for both MUA and MC, we can derive the data for STs by subtracting the data of MC from those of MUA. We shall study the patterns of migration from the distribution of the number of migrants from the rural and urban last residences.

### Patterns of Migration into MC, 1971

Distribution of the number of migrants in MC by the rural and urban last residences is presented in Table 5.

---

11. In the Census 1971 Migration Tables the whole of MUA has been treated as a district.

Table 5 : Distribution of Migrants in MC from various Places of Last Residence by Rural and Urban Areas, in 1971

| Last Residence (1) | Number of Migrants | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Rural (2) | Urban (3) | Total (4) |
| Outside India | NA | NA | 15,765 (3.62) |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 71,840 (19.48) | 1,34,570 (34.58) | 2,06,410 (26.24) |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 2,96,985 (80.52) | 2,40,695 (61.85) | 5,37,680 (68.37) |
| In the STs of MUA | --- | 13,895 (3.57) | 13,895 (1.77) |
| Total in MC | 3,68,825 (100.00) | 3,89,160 (100.00) | 7,86,475 (100.00) |

Note: Figures in the parantheses indicate the percentage in column total.

Table 5 indicates that the most dominant pattern of migration is of interdistrict type, followed by the inter-state type of migration which is significant but far below the former type. International and intra-agglomeration migrations into MC are of very low orders. We shall, therefore, consider that the important patterns of migration into MC as, first interdistrict, and secondly the inter state types.

The above observations of table 5 implies that the volume of migration declines as the physical and/socio-economic distance between the MC and the last residences increase: This is indicated by interstate or interdistrict type of migration. For example interstate type of migration implies either a greater physical or a greater socio-economic distance

or both as compared to the interdistrict type of migration. Though this distance in the case of intra-agglomeration migration is perhaps the least compared to other types of migration, the extent of migration from the STs to MC is the smallest. This could be due to the reason, in the earlier section, that MC is much less attractive to migrants in comparison to the STs.

Given the above broad patterns of movement among the migrants in MC, we now turn to the rural/urban comparison of migration in each of the above patterns. Table 6 shows the rural-MC and urban-MC patterns of migration, in percentage terms. The table is derived from table 5.

Table 6 : Percentage distribution of migrants in MC in 1971 by rural and urban areas of each place of last residence

| Last Redisence (1) | Rural (2) | Urban (3) | Total (4) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | -- | -- | 100.00 |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 34.80 | 65.20 | 100.00 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 55.23 | 44.77 | 100.00 |
| In the STs of MUA | -- | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Total in MC | 48.66* | 51.34* | 100.00 |

*Figures are based on the intra-national migration alone. In the absence of rural/urban data international migration we excluded this component from the total migrants, and the figures are derived from the total of columns 2 and 3 in the last row of table 5.

Table 6 shows that within the inter district pattern, the most significant in MC is the rural-urban or rural-MC
Contrary to this, the urban-MC type of migration

However, in the overall pattern urban-urban type of migration is the dominant pattern. These facts suggest that though there is a difference between the rural and urban areas in terms of socio-economic characteristics, the difference does not matter when people migrate within the state, but it does in the case of inter-state migration.

Summary of observation

1. Interdistrict and interstate migration patterns appear to be significant among the migrants in MC, where the former is far stronger than the latter pattern.

2. Within the interdistrict pattern fural-urban type of movement is stronger than urban-urban type. In the case of interstate migration urban-urban movement is very strong. That is, most of the rural migrants came from within the state and most of the urban migrants came from other states.

Districts and States of Last Residence

Census Migration Tables of 1971 do not provide any data on the specific districts from which the migrants came to MUA. But the previous Census (1961) data on migration, according to place of birth concept, suggest that most of the migrants in MC in 1961 came from the contiguous districts, such as Chingleput, North Arcot, South Arcot and Thanjavur, which have the largest share among the interdistrict migrants.[12] With the help of 1971 census data, based on the place of birth concept, also it is shown that usually the migrants moved across continuous districts.[13] This may be true in the case of migrants by place of last residence (PLR) according to 1971 census.

----------

12. Census of India, 1961/Special Migration Tables; Madras City, Vol.IX, Part X-(II), 1965.

13. C.T.Kurien, (1980).

As for interstate movement among the migrants in MC, the data, based on the PLR concept, suggest that as much as 75 per cent of the migrants came to MC from Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka in that order. These are also the contiguous states around Tamil Nadu.

The above two points indicate that physical distance plays a significant role in determining the volume of migration, though the socio-economic forces may as well be present in that. From the point of view of the nature of urbanisation in MC, it can be said that the influence of urbanisation tends to decline as the distance increases.

## Patterns of Migration in STs in 1971

From the distribution of migrants in STs, according to 1971 Census data, various patterns of movement are shown in Table 7. It shows that the largest number of migrants in

Table 7 Distribution of Migrants in STs from Various Places of Last Residence by Rural and Urban Areas, in 1971

| Last Residence | Number of Migrants | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Rural | Urban | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Outside India | -- | -- | 7,840 (2.47) |
| In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 19,730 (16.27) | 38,840 (16.58) | 58,570 (16.07) |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 1,01,530 (83.73) | 53,615 (22.89) | 1,55,145 (42.56) |
| In MC | -- | 1,41,815 (60.53) | 1,41,815 (38.90) |
| Total in STs | 1,21,260 (100.00) | 2,34,270 (100.00) | 3,77,265 (100.00) |

Note: Figures in the parantheses indicate percentage in column total.

Sts is from within the State. Within that the interdistrict migration pattern is the predominant one, closely followed by the intra-agglomeration migration. Compared to these the interstate migration is rather insignificant (col.4). This clearly shows again that the volume of migration declines with the increase in distance. An interesting feature of migration into STs is that while most migrants from rural areas are from other districts of Tamil Nadu, outside MUA (col.2), the largest member of urban migrants to STs are from MC (col.3).

Within each pattern above, the comparison of migration flow from rural and urban areas to STs is presented in Table 8. It shows that the rural-urban migration is stronger than

Table 8 Percentage Distribution of Migrants in STs by Rural and Urban Areas in each Place of Last Residence, in 1971

| Last Residence | Rural | Urban | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | -- | -- | 100.00 |
| In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 33.69 | 66.31 | 100.00 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 65.44 | 34.56 | 100.00 |
| In MC | -- | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Total in STs | 34.11* | 65.89* | 100.00 |

*/Figures are based on intra-national migration alone, for reasons cited in the note to table 6 (p-15)/

urban-urban (STs) type in interdistrict migration. In interstate migration, which is rather weak as we saw (Table 7), urban-urban (STs) migration is fairly strong.

This shows again that socio-economic differences between the rural and urban areas do not deter the flow of migration within the state.

Summary of observations

1. Migrants in STs are predominantly from within the state, within that the interdistrict pattern is equally strong as the intra-agglomeration pattern of migration.

2. Most of the rural migrants came from other districts outside MUA and the majority of the urban migrants came from Madras city. This implies that the industrialisation in the STs had its impact contained within the state.

Comparison of Patterns of Migration into MC and STs

We have noted earlier that the interdistrict and interstate patterns of migration are very significant in MC whereas interdistrict and intra-agglomeration migration are the most significant patterns in the STs. In both places, however, the interdistrict migration pattern is the dominant one.

Among the intra-agglomeration migrants, those from MC to STs are 10 times as many as those from the STs to MC (compare Tables 5 & 7). The migrants from MC to the STs are about 1.4 lakhs, and those from the STs to MC are 0.13 lakhs. In view of this huge exodus from MC to STs, it would be pertinent to ask if a large number of these migrants were also migrants in MC. That is, is there a possibility that some migrants came to MC first and then stepped to the STs? This remains a fair possibility because the resident population of MC may not be moving out to the STs at a large scale. We do not know from the present census data as to what proportion of 1.4 lakh migrants from MC to STs is of resident population of MC. This question we shall attempt to answer in the analysis of the survey data on migration.

As for the comparison of rural and urban migrants in MC and the STs, it can be seen from the Tables 5 & 7 that the percentage of interdistrict rural migrants to MC is higher than that of the interdistrict rural migrants to the STs. And among the migrants from the other districts of Tamil Nadu the proportion of the rural migrants to MC is lower than the proportion of rural migrants to the STs. This distribution of rural urban migrants from other states to MC and to the STs appear to be similar.

## Concluding observations

It appears that the influence of urbanisation of MC and the STs has not stretched beyond the neighbouring districts and the neighbouring states of Tamil Nadu. In interesting point is that while MC has pulled a substantial number of migrants from other states the STs have not. The nonsignificant interstate migration into the STs, given the growth of manufacturing activities in these towns, requires an explanation. Perhaps the interstate migrants do not come with a specific skill suitable for the 'manufacturing' sector employment, but they flock into MC where they can survive on the activities other than manufacturing. We shall see later that a very low proportion of the interstate migrants is involved in the 'production and related' workers' category, as compared to the interdistrict migrants to MUA (See section V). This may be true, because there was a larger scope for employment in the tertiary sector in MC as seen in Table 1 (section I).

# IV

## Nature of Migration into MUA

We have noted, in the previous section, the patterns of migration, i.e., where did the migrants come from, or what were the characteristics of the places of last residence among the migrants in MC and STs separately. We intend to examine now how have they moved into MUA. More especially, we shall examine whether the migrants came to MC

or STs in one step or in a number of steps, or whether the migrants moved out of MC or STs and again came back to the respective places at the time of 1971 Census enumeration. Hence the attempt here is to find if step and return migration are present in the census data. Owing to the limitations of data we shall show only the possibilities of such a nature of migration rather than a conclusive evidence.

Census 1971 data on migration are based on the PLR concept which includes the combined figures of migrants by place of birth (POB) concept, step and return migrants (see Appendix I). So it is not possible to isolate each one of these migrants. But we have the data on population for the whole of MUA, by their places of birth, such as outside the State of Tamil Nadu, outside the district of enumeration etc. (Table DI). This helps us finding migrants, by their POB, in the whole of MUA, but not in MC separately. Therefore, subtracting the migrants into MUA by POB concept from the migrants into MUA by PLR concept, we can arrive at the combined estimates of step and return migrants. However, the data on migration by POB and PLR concepts can be used to obtain international, interstate and interdistrict patterns. Intra-agglomeration migration by POB concept cannot be obtained from Table DI of Census 1971 because it is not clear from the census table whether the 'persons born within the district is meant for the 'persons born within the agglomeration'. In neither case it shows any intra-agglomeration migration by POB concept. Table 9 (a,b,c) showing different nature of migration into MUA is based on the original census data by POB concept (9a) and corrected table of total migration by PLR concept (9b). Nature of migration into MUA is shown in Table 9c which is obtained by subtracting the elements of 9a from the corresponding elements of 9b.

Table 9a Distribution of Migrants in MUA by their Rural/Urban Places of Birth, in 1971

| Place of Birth | Total | Rural | Urban |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 39,075 | -- | -- |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 2,63,050 | 1,00,930 | 1,62,120 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 7,30,630 | 4,25,970 | 3,04,660 |
| Total in MUA | 10,32,755 | 5,26,900 | 4,66,780 |

Table 9b Distribution of Migrants in MUA by their Rural/Urban Places of Last Residence, in 1971

| Last Residence | Total | Rural | Urban |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 39,075 | -- | -- |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 2,73,240 | 1,00,930 | 1,72,310 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 7,34,175 | 4,25,970 | 3,08,205 |
| Total in MUA | 10,46,490 | 5,26,900 | 4,80,515 |

Table 9c Step and Return migration in MUA from Rural/Urban Places of Last Residence in 1971

| Last Residence | Total | Rural | Urban |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 0 | -- | -- |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 10,190 | 0 | 10,190 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 3,545 | 0 | 3,545 |
| Total in MUA | 13,735 | 0 | 13,735 |

Table 9c shows the number of step and return migrants from various places of last residence. The zero elements in the rural cells appear partly because of the problem discussed in Appendix I, and partly because, (i) the people from urban areas of MUA did not go to rural areas to reside and come back as return migrants and (ii) the migrants from rural or urban areas outside MUA did not step into another rural area before steping into MUA. Which one of the latter two factors is at play cannot be determined, but problem of sampling in the census data has had much to do with this problem.

However, the number of step and return migrants from urban last residences appear to be consistent, i.e. PLR concept must include these migrants over above the migrants by POB concept. But the reliability of the estimates cannot be checked. Given this, the number of step and return migrants in MUA from other states/the largest. Is it correct?

We have noted earlier in the patterns of migration that most of the interstate migrants came to MUA from the contiguous states, such as Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka. Would they go to other states before coming to MUA? Perhaps not. Then, it is possible that, (i) those who migrated from MUA to other states, including the contiguous ones, had come back to MUA by 1971, and (ii) those who came from distant states had stepped first to a state outside Tamil Nadu and then migrated to MUA.

Interdistrict step and return migration appears to be too low. However, if the estimate is correct (i.e. if census data are correct) it implies that a larger number of migrants from within the state came to MUA directly rather than through step or return migration. It is possible that most migrants came from contiguous districts of MUA and need not have multiple steps because distance does not pose a problem in such a case. Further, it is unlikely that a large number of migrants from

a big urban area as MUA would go to other cities or towns outside MUA to return later. Therefore, it is possible that interdistrict return and step migration is small. But we cannot check if the actual estimates should be as small as the one in 9c.

What is, however, possible is that the migrants step either into MC or into STs from other districts and step out either to STs or to MC. That is, among the inter-district migrants in MUA it is possible that they show intra-agglomeration movement. This is ofcourse possible among the inter-state migrants also. These possibilities have been discussed in the previous section.[14]

Summary of Observations

In short, the number of step and return migrants in MUA is very small and the census 1971 estimates of migrants by PLR concept based on sample is likely to be non-representative of this nature of migration. Hence the observations suggest possibilities and not conclusive evidences. Given this problem, the data indicate that a large number of inter-state migrants in MUA stepped into other states outside Tamil Nadu either from another state or from MUA itself. Fewer interdistrict migrants came to MUA as step or return migrants.

Since the data of 1971 on interstate and interdistrict step and return migrants are not separable for specific states or districts a hypothesis that the longer the distance the higher is the possibility of step migration needs to be tested with the help of more elaborate survey data. Such a relation cannot be hypothesised for return migration. Regarding return migration more important question would be how do the migrants decide on such moves. Do they migrate without a plan and later come back to the previous place of residence, having failed in the mission; or do they outmigrate to a place

---

14. See Section III.

and come back to the previous place as a matter of planned moves. Such planned moves, of course, are found to exist among the rural-urban-rural migrants in Asia and Africa.[15]

V

## Socio-Economic Characteristics of Migrants in MUA

In this section we shall attempt to identify as to who the migrants are. Do the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants in MUA differ across the patterns of migration? Further, in view of the fact that the core city and the STs of MUA had different natures of economic development we shall also examine if the migrants' socio-economic characteristics in these two places are different from each other. That is, whether the nature of development in MC and STs have generated two different streams of migration which show different socio-economic characteristics of migrants in these places.

Migrants' socio-economic characteristics will include the following:

(i) The workers' participation rates, i.e. the percentage of workers in total migrants.

(ii) The nature of economic activities the migrants are associated with.

(iii) The migrants' occupational characteristics and

(iv) the migrants' educational levels.

We shall use the data available from the Migration Tables DIII and DV of census 1971. Table DIII provides distribution of the migrants by educational levels and occupational groups, whereas table DV provides the distribution of migrants by tenfold industrial activities. Both tables provide data on the characteristics of the migrants from various places

15. See Connell et. al (1976)

of last residence, but the rural/urban distinction is missing in DIII only. Further, table DV is available for MUA as well as MC, whereas table DIII is available only for MUA. Non-availability of table DIII for MC will restrict the analysis to MUA; in the process the educational and occupational characteristics of the migrants separately in MC and STs will be missed out. With these limitations we shall analyse the migrants' characteristics (i) and (ii) for MC and STs separately and (iii) and (iv) for MUA as a whole.

## Workers' Participation Rates of Migrants in MC

Workers' participation rates (WPR) of the male and female migrants in MC from rural and urban last residence are presented in Table 10. Broadly, the table indicates that the female WPRs, irrespective of the places of last residence, are extremely low and are close to the female WPR of the total female population. That is, the female migrants are basically of dependant type and there is hardly any difference between the female migrants and the resident female population in this regard. This may imply that the majority of the female migrants did not come to MC in search of job, perhaps they migrated due to marital connection. However, since the WPRs for the female migrants are very low we shall not examine their association with industrial activities.

The male WPRs (Table 10), in contrast to female, are extremely high. Comparing them across patterns of migration, it appears that between interstate and interdistrict patterns, the most significant ones in MC, the WPRs do not vary much. This implies that the migrants from other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu and the migrants from the districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA came to MC for the same purpose of earning their livelihood.

Comparisons of the WPRs of the male migrants from rural and urban areas shows that the WPRs of the rural migrants in MC are significantly above the WPRs of the urban migrants.

That is, a larger number among the rural migrants came to MC in search of employment than that among the urban migrants. A good proportion of the urban migrants came as dependants.[16]

Table 10 Sexwise Workers' Participation Rates (percentage of migrant workers in total migrants) of Migrants in MC, in 1971, from Rural and Urban Last Residence

| Last Residence* | Male | | | Female | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Outside India | -- | -- | 60.88 | -- | -- | 7.04 |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 75.53 | 65.93 | 69.46 | 7.86 | 7.67 | 7.73 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 74.16 | 66.09 | 70.56 | 6.15 | 8.14 | 7.10 |
| Total Migrant Workers' participation Rates in MC | 74.44 | 66.03 | 69.90 | 6.46 | 7.98 | 7.26 |
| Workers' Participation Rates of the Population in MC | -- | -- | 49.00 | -- | -- | 5.00 |

*No data on the working and nonworking migrants from STs to MC are available.

---

16. It is possible that the urban migrants to MC came with their family where the male children may be still studying. In contrast, the rural migrants might have moved to MC in singles to a greater extent than the urban migrants did in search of employment. That the urban-MC migration is more familial than the rural-MC migration has been shown in Appendix II.

Another feature of Table 10 is that the WPR of the total male migrants in MC is substantially higher than the WPR of the total male population. This indicates that while the majority of the nonmigrant population of MC are dependant, the majority of the male migrants are workers. As such a very high WPR among the male migrants indicates that most of the male migrants came to MC in search of job.

On the whole Table 10 shows that basically the male migrants came to MC in search of employment whereas the female migrants came as dependants. Further, among the male migrants a larger proportion of the total rural migrants came in search of employment as compared to the proportion of total urban migrants, ignoring the female WPR, we can see that only difference in the WPR for the male migrants occurs between rural and urban areas, and not between interstate and interdistrict migration. However, if most of the migrants came in search of employment, then migration should have some relationship with the pattern of growth of the industrial activities in MC.

## Migrant Workers* in MC Across Industrial Activities

Given the broad characteristics of the migrants in terms of workers and nonworkers we attempt to answer if the association of migrant workers with specific industrial activities differs across patterns of migration. This may hint us as to whether the migrant workers from different places of last residence came to MC in response to the pattern of development of industrial activities in MC. We shall examine this from the percentage distribution of migrant workers in MC across major industrial activities. But before that we shall examine in which industrial activities the migrant workers play dominant role relative to the total working population in MC.

---

*Only male workers are included here, because of low WPR of the female migrants.

In order to find out the role played by migrants vis-a-vis the resident population in the industrial activities we have presented the share of male migrant workers in total male workers in 1971 for each activity in Table 11.

Table 11 Migrant and Resident Workers Across Economic Activities in MC, 1971

| Industrial Activity | Migrant workers in MC (Male) | Working Population in MC (Male) | Percentage of Male Migrant Workers to Total Male Workers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cultivators + Agricultural Labourers + hunters etc. | 3,170 | 10,197 | 31.09 |
| Mining and Quarrying | 105 | 217 | 48.39 |
| Household Manufacturing | 2,945 | 9,569 | 30.78 |
| Non-household manufacturing | 69,870 | 1,74,045 | 40.14 |
| Construction | 13,865 | 31,067 | 44.63 |
| Trade and Commerce | 95,520 | 1,61,095 | 59.29 |
| Transport, Storage and Communication | 51,640 | 1,24,278 | 41.55 |
| Other services | 63,740 | 1,26,356 | 50.44 |
| Total Workers | 3,00,855 | 6,36,824 | 47.24 |

Source: Migration Table DV of Census 1971.

Table 11 shows that migrant workers dominate over the resident workers in trade and commerce sector. Also, in the tertiary sector as a whole (i.e. trade & commerce, transport, storage and communication and other services) the share of migrant workers in total workers is 51.22 per cent, which

indicates the migrants' dominance over the resident workers in these sector, given the migrant workers' dominance in trade and commerce. In the nonhousehold manufacturing activity, an important sector, the resident population is the dominant group. It can be seen from the table that the highest concentration of the resident workers is in the 'manufacturing' activity while that of the migrants is in the 'trade and commerce' activity. The second highest concentration for the resident workers is in trade and commerce whereas for the migrant workers is the second highest concentration is in the manufacturing sector. We know that MC grew in manufacturing and trade and commerce activities mainly since 1951 onwards. But the distribution of the migrants and resident workers suggest that while the resident workers have benefited more from the industrial growth in MC, however slow, migrant workers have flocked towards the trade and commerce sector in MC which also grew closely with the manufacturing sector. If the growth rate of migrants into MC has some positive relationship with the nature of urbanisation, the distribution of the migrant and resident workers in Table 11 may suggest that the migrants moved to MC in response to industrialisation but the resident workers cornered the manufacturing sector employment and therefore the migrants concentrated in 'unproductive' activity like trade and commerce. It is possible that a large number of migrants came to MC without any skill and had to enter trade and commerce activity for their living.

We shall now to back to the association of the male migrant workers with specific industrial activities across patterns of migration. As stated earlier, we have presented the percentage distribution of male migrant workers in 1971, across activities and patterns of migration in Table 12. The table shows that the highest concentration of the migrant workers (male) is in the trade and commerce activity. Next to this stand the nonhousehold manufacturing sector and the other services, in that order. These observations are true for almost all the patterns of migration.

Table 12 Percentage Distribution of Migrant Workers in MC, in 1971, from Rural and Urban Last Residence Across Industrial Activities

| Last Residence / Industrial Activities | Outside India | In Other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | | | In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | | | Total Migr workers in |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | |
| Cultivators + Agricultural labourers + livestock; hunter, fishermen etc. | 0.35 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 1.57 | 0.91 | 1.29 | 1.06 |
| Mining and Quarrying | -- | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| Household Manufacturing | 1.22 | 1.19 | 0.93 | 1.03 | 0.83 | 1.11 | 0.95 | 0.98 |
| Nonhousehold Manufacturing | 20.80 | 18.81 | 26.03 | 23.15 | 22.30 | 24.85 | 23.37 | 23.22 |
| Construction | 3.20 | 1.77 | 2.16 | 2.00 | 6.98 | 3.82 | 5.66 | 4.61 |
| Trade & Commerce | 34.91 | 43.03 | 36.10 | 38.87 | 29.90 | 27.52 | 28.91 | 31.75 |
| Transport, Storage and Communication | 21.61 | 13.51 | 13.25 | 13.35 | 19.47 | 16.91 | 18.40 | 17.16 |
| Other services | 17.91 | 21.08 | 20.99 | 21.03 | 18.94 | 24.83 | 21.40 | 21.19 |
| Total Workers | 100.00 | 100.01 | 100.00 | 99.99 | 100.01 | 100.00 | 101.01 | 100.01 |

Comparison of the distribution of the 1971 migrant shows that there is an increase in the concentration of them workers with 1961 migrant workers/in 'trade and commerce', 'nonhousehold manufacturing' and 'transport, storage and communication' activities.[17] Increase in the percentage concentration is rather large for 'trade and commerce' and the 'transport, storage and communication' sectors as compared to manufacturing sector. That is the migrant workers are fast concentrating except for other services, in the tertiary sectors, and slowly in the manufacturing sectors. The comparison over the decades 1961 and 1971 is only suggestive because of the change in the definition of workers between the periods and also because the migrants data in 1961 are based on the place of birth concept, whereas the migrants data in 1971 are based on the place of last residence concept. The 1971 definition is likely to include less number of workers than would the 1961 definition include; at the same time the place of last residence concept is likely to include more migrants than the 1961 place of birth concept. The problem of definition apart, the change in concentration of migrant workers could be due to the new entrants of the migrants in these activities and/or shift of occupation from one activity to another which would indicate the footlooseness of the migrants in terms of occupation. We do not know exactly what processes are involved in the change in the concentration of migrant workers across industrial activities.

------------

17. Percentage Distribution of Migrant Workers Across Activities in 1961 and 1971

| Year \ Activity | Mining etc. | H.H. Mfg. | Non H.H. Mfg. | Constn. | Trade and Comm. | Trans-port etc. | Other Ser-vices |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1971 | 0.04 | 0.99 | 23.47 | 4.66 | 32.09 | 17.35 | 21.41 |
| 1961 | 0.70 | 1.10 | 21.20 | 4.30 | 22.70 | 13.10 | 36.90 |

See Census of India, 1961, Special Migration Tables, Madras City, Vol.IX, Part X-(II).

As for the characteristics of the migrants in this section we can summarise that:

1. Most male migrants came to MC in search of work and the females came as dependants.

2. Male migrants, in terms of static data of 1971, are significantly associated with the activities like 'trade and commerce', 'manufacturing', 'other services' and 'transport storage and communication'. Of them a large proportion of the migrants is associated with the tertiary activities.

It cannot be said clearly from the above if the concentration of migrant workers in different activities is a result of the growth of those activities (as cited above). In fact, the pattern of increase in the share of workers in each activity (Table 1, Section I) is slightly different from the static distribution of 1971 census migrant workers in each activity in MC. The data merely suggest that a large number of migrants has entered the tertiary sectors, though they might be induced to migrate by the increased prospect of employment in the 'manufacturing' sector.

Workers' Participation Rates of Migrants in the STs

Workers' participation rates (WPR) of the male and female migrants in the STs from the rural and urban areas of the last residences are presented in Table 13. As in MC, in the STs also the female WPRs are extremely low indicating the female migrants' dependency characteristics. They are as dependent as the resident female population.

As for male, the WPRs are very high, as compared to the total population in the STs. That is, the migrants came to the STs primarily connection with employment. However, the broad tendency is that the larger number among the interstate male migrants came in search of work, whereas fewer among the interdistrict male migrants migrated in search of employment. Since the interdistrict pattern is far stronger than the

Table 13: Sexwise workers' participation rates (percentage of migrant workers in total migrants) of migrants in STs, in 1971, from rural and urban last residence and workers' participation rates of the total population

| Last Residence | Male | | | Female | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Outside India | -- | -- | 58.58 | -- | -- | 8.80 |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 74.20 | 67.92 | 70.01 | 7.27 | 5.77 | 6.29 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 68.13 | 60.34 | 65.17 | 9.53 | 7.61 | 8.99 |
| Total migrant workers' participation rates in STs | 69.29 | 63.64 | 66.35 | 9.22 | 6.99 | 8.36 |
| Workers participation rates of population in STs. | -- | -- | 49.00 | -- | -- | 6.00 |

interstate pattern in the STs, the male WPRs of the total migrants in the STs are close to the interdistrict male WPRs. Even that being very high it can be said that generally the male migrants came to the STs in search of work. This is in contrast to what we observed in MC, where there was a negligible difference in male WPRs between the interstate and interdistrict patterns.

Between rural and urban male migrants, a larger number among the rural migrants came as workers than as dependants as compared to those came from urban areas to STs. Similar rural and urban differences in WPR are observed for MC also. Perhaps the rural male migrants from other states and other districts of Tamil Nadu came under economic distress while fewer urban migrants came under such condition. A few among the urban migrants might have come for education in the urban areas.

The aggregate male workers' participation rates (i.e. for male migrants from all last residences) suggest that male migrants came to STs in connection with work. But a comparison with MC (Table 10) shows that fewer male migrants came for work, to the STs than to MC, though the aggregate WPRs between these two places do not differ substantially.

In short, the male migrants in MUA came in search of employment whereas females came as dependants. Generally, a larger number among the rural migrants came to MUA in search of job than that among the urban migrants. This, however, raises question if the rural-MC and the rural-STs migrants are much poorer than the urban migrants in these places. For the rural migrants in the STs or in MC, the higher WPR (male) is is an indication of their poverty.[18] But this question needs to be investigated with the help of field data.

---

18. Rural migrants in STs have a very high sex ratio which indicates high extent of familial migration. It has been noted elsewhere that the unasseted migrants (mainly agricultural labourers) from rural areas move with their family whereas asseted ones leave the female and children behind to take care of the assets. This is experienced among the rural migrants in Kanpur, Jullunder and Fatehbad.(See JRT report). This is possible in the case of rural migrants in MUA also.

As for the intra-agglomeration migration the WPR for male is about 52 per cent[19] and for female is about five per cent. Such a low WPR for female is a reflection of their dependence. But a low WPR for male migrants, close to the WPR of the population of STs (49%), indicates that the migration mainly from MC to STs is not quite related to job search alone. Along with the very low WPR the sex ratio of the migrants from MC to the STs has been very high (See Appendix II, Table II.7), indicating a high extent of familial migration. The high sex ratio and low WPR might mean that people migrated from MC to STs for cheaper housing facility in the STs, given the proper transport connection. In short, it could be a migration that is associated with the process of suburbanisation. Contrary to this, it was argued that the towns around MC grew <u>somewhat</u> independently of the events in MC and thus were not the result of suburbanisation around MC (Kurien, 1971). But the low WPR and high sex ratio of the migrants from MC to STs suggest a process of suburbanisation which needs a further careful examination.

## Migrant Workers' in STs Across Industrial Activities

Given the characteristics of the male migrants that most of them came in search of work in the STs, we shall examine now if the process of urbanisation in STs, through industrialisation, has any influence on the migrants from various last residences. In other words, did the migrants come to STs in response to industrialisation?

We do not have data of migrants in STs over time, hence we shall try to answer the question from the percentage distribution of working male migrants across activities at a point of time, i.e., in 1971.[20] The percentage distributions of the

---

19. The WPR includes working migrants both from MC to STs as well as from STs to MC. Since the former set has the number of migrants 10 times that of the latter set, the WPR will generally reflect the characteristics of the migrants from MC to STs.

20. For brevity's sake we have avoided examining the role of working migrants vis-a-vis the working population in each activity in STs. In fact, on low population base, as our data suggest, the dominance of migrant workers over resident population is too high.

male working migrants in the STs across the patterns of migration and industrial activities, and of intra-agglomeration male working migrants across activities are presented in Table 14.

It can be seen from Table 14 that the 'nonhousehold manufacturing' activity has the highest concentration of migrant workers. Next to this stands 'other services'; and 'trade and commerce' and 'transport, storage and communication', unlike in MC, relegate to minor positions. The same pattern is obtained for almost every pattern of migration into the STs.

Highest concentration of total male working population in 'manufacturing' activity may suggest that relatively greater employment opportunity in STs was created through industrialisation and the role of 'other services' became important because of the multiplier effect of industrialisation. Coupled with this, the distribution of intra-agglomeration migrants, most of which are from MC to the STs is an indication that migrants from MC responded to the pattern of urbanisation in STs. Since the distributions of migrant workers in the STs from 'other countries', 'other states of India' and 'other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA' are similar for the total working population and the intra-agglomeration migrants in the STs, it is possible to infer that all migrants came to the STs in response to the pattern of urbanisation, through industrialisation.

Above observations provide hints that migrant workers' association with the industrial activities in the STs is a result primarily of industrialisation therein, and the growth of related activities secondary to industrialisation. If this is so, does this have an implication for skilled and unskilled migrants? Perhaps, yes, while 'manufacturing' activity is likely to draw to a large extent skilled migrants, other activities need not do so to the same extent. Since

Table 14 Percentage distribution of Male Migrant Workers in STs, in 1971, from rural and urban last residence across industrial activities

| Last Residence / Industrial Activity | Outside India | In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu: Rural | Urban | Total | In other districts of Tamil Nadu Beyond MUA: Rural | Urban | Total | Total Migrant Workers in ST | Total Working Population in STs | Intra-Agglomeration migrant workers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultivators + Agrl. labourers + live-stock; hunters, fishermen etc. | 3.87 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.78 | 7.4 | 1.98 | 5.48 | 3.97 | 11.59 | 5.27 |
| Mining & Quarrying | --- | --- | --- | --- | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Household Manufacturing | 0.58 | 1.64 | 0.96 | 1.20 | 2.49 | 2.42 | 2.46 | 2.01 | 2.41 | 2.22 |
| Non-household Manu-facturing | 34.24 | 37.48 | 37.33 | 37.38 | 36.67 | 42.91 | 38.87 | 38.25 | 36.27 | 37.58 |
| Construction | 2.71 | 1.29 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 4.71 | 2.39 | 3.89 | 3.03 | 3.81 | 4.16 |
| Trade and Commerce | 17.41 | 20.06 | 15.67 | 17.21 | 18.08 | 14.74 | 16.91 | 17.02 | 13.80 | 15.48 |
| Transport, Storage and Communication | 14.12 | 8.80 | 6.99 | 7.63 | 12.8 | 11.08 | 12.19 | 10.84 | 13.03 | 15.76 |
| Other services | 27.08 | 29.85 | 37.11 | 34.55 | 17.80 | 24.46 | 20.14 | 24.85 | 19.06 | 19.49 |
| Total workers | 100.01 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 99.99 | 100.01 | 100.01 | 99.99 | 100.00 | 100.01 | 100.00 |

'manufacturing' activity has the highest concentration of workers, we can say also that this activity drew a large number of skilled migrants from various places. This aspect however, remains a subject of investigation in future with the help of direct information.

Finally, we may observe that the association between the distribution of migrant workers across the activities in MC and the STs and the nature of urbanisation in these places is just a suggestive observation. The association is not quite clear from the data, mainly of Census 1971 alone. For testing an association as to whether the growth of a particular activity has drawn a particular type of migrants we need, at the first place, a time series data of both the total as well as migrant workers in each activity. Secondly, we need to know the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants associated with each activity. For instance, if the migrants are concentrated in the 'trade and commerce' activities we shall look for the migrants' asset position whereas for the migrants in manufacturing activity we shall look for the specific skill characteristics. Such are the data requirements to examine the relationship between the nature of urbanisation and the migrants' response to that, but the hypothesis regarding such an association cannot yet be ruled out and requires to be tested.

## Occupational and Educational Characteristics of Migrants in MUA

Data on the educational and occupational characteristics of the migrants in MUA, from the places of last residence, are available from Migration Table DIII of Census 1971. Since the data are given only for MUA, and not for MC, separate analysis for MC and STs is not possible. Moreover DIII does not provide disaggregation of data upto rural and urban areas. The data on intra-agglomeration migrants' characteristics are also not given in DIII. To this extent, our analysis will miss characterisation of an important stream of migrants from MC to STs.

Therefore, we shall analyse the educational and occupational characteristics of the interstate and interdistrict migrants in MUA only. We shall take up the educational characteristics of the migrants first.

Educational Characteristics of the Migrants in MUA

Percentage distribution of the male and female migrants for each educational level and pattern of migration is presented in Table 15. The table indicates that for the major patterns, such as interstate and interdistrict patterns of migration, migrants are concentrated in 'middle+higher secondary', 'literate+primary' and 'illiterate' levels of education, in that order. Very few are highly educated. We shall concentrate on the three major educational levels, from 'illiterate' to 'middle+higher secondary'.

Within these levels for males, by and large, migrants' concentration increases with the increase in the scale of educational levels. For females, the trend is just opposite. More and more of the female migrants have lower and lower level of education.

Generally, for both the major patterns of migration, a significant proportion of migrants are literates and above. This is true of both male and female, but among the female the proportion of 'literates and above' is much less than among the male. This could partly explain as to why workers' participation rates for female are low. A comparison of the 'literate and above' category of migrants across the patterns of migration suggests that the proportions of migrants, in the 'literate and above' levels are similar for the interstate and interdistrict patterns of migration. We can, therefore, say that the urbanisation in MUA has attracted similar kind of people, irrespective of physical and socio-economic distance between MUA and the states outside Tamil Nadu and the districts within Tamil Nadu.

Table 15 Sex-wise Percentage Distribution of Migrants in MUA from Various last Residences across Educational Levels

| Educational level / Last Residence | Male: Illi-trates | Male: Litera-tes and Primary | Male: Middle + Higher Secon-dary | Male: Non Tech Dip + Tech Dip + Non Tech UG & PG + Tech UG & PG | Male: Others | Male: Total | Female: Illi-trates | Female: Litera-tes and primary | Female: Midd-le + High-er Secon-dary | Female: Non Tech Dip + Tech Dip +Non Tech UG & PG + Tech UG+ PG | Female: others | Female: Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 20.72 | 50.29 | 26.58 | 2.41 | --- | 100 | 52.31 | 35.59 | 11.67 | 0.43 | - | 100 |
| In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 17.29 | 27.95 | 49.03 | 5.72 | 0.01 | 100 | 35.23 | 30.45 | 32.42 | 1.89 | - | 99.99 |
| In other districts in Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 18.27 | 31.86 | 41.24 | 8.57 | 0.05 | 99.99 | 44.13 | 29.09 | 25.12 | 1.66 | - | 100 |
| Total | 18.21 | 31.69 | 41.86 | 8.19 | 0.05 | 100 | 43.46 | 29.29 | 25.59 | 1.66 | - | 100 |

Occupational Characteristics at Given Levels of Education

Table 15 indicated that about 90 per cent of migrants, especially the male, are at three levels of education, illiterate to higher secondary. Since there are very few migrants beyond these levels of education, we shall consider the occupational characteristics of only these migrants. Owing to the low workers' participation rates of female we shall ignore them also. So we are left with only the male migrants at three major educational levels. For the three major educational levels, the percentage distribution of the male migrant workers across occupation is presented in Table 16.

Table 16 shows, for interdistrict pattern, the dominance of 'production workers' and the 'sales and service workers' among the illiterates and the 'literates and primary'. They together account for 90 per cent of the workers at each of the two levels of education. At the 'middle and secondary' level, 'clerical', 'production' and 'sales and service' workers dominate over other occupations. Total of all three levels of education indicates that 'production', 'sales and service' and the 'clerical' workers dominate numerically over other occupations.

For the interstate total migrants the dominant occupations are 'production', 'sales and service', and 'administrative, executive etc' workers, in that order.

From the above what is clear is the predominance of 'production' and 'sales and service' workers in MUA. They perhaps reflect, rather indirectly, the predominance of industrial activity on the one hand, and the 'trade and commerce' on the other.

Comparing the 'production' workers between interdistrict and interstate migration we can see that among the interdistrict migrants a large number supplies what may be called

Table 16 Occupational Distribution of the Migrants in MUA at Given Educational Levels, 1971

| Occupations / Educational level | All occupations | Cultivators, Agri labourers farmers etc. | Sales workers & Service workers | Professional Technical etc. | Administrative Executive etc. | Clerical workers etc. | Production workers etc. | Unclassified |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Migrants from districts of Tamil Nadu outside MUA - Male** | | | | | | | | |
| Illitrates | 100 | 6.15 | 25.08 | 0.64 | -- | 1.63 | 65.95 | 0.55 |
| Literates + Primary | 100.00 | 1.77 | 39.22 | 2.01 | 0.25 | 6.53 | 50.2 | 0.025 |
| Middle + Higher Secondary | 99.99 | 0.453 | 23.96 | 7.03 | 1.23 | 37.1 | 30.16 | 0.060 |
| Total | 100 | 1.83 | 27.45 | 8.33 | 1.14 | 20.75 | 40.37 | 0.13 |
| **Inter-State Migrants - Male** | | | | | | | | |
| Illitrates | 100.01 | 2.86 | 44.21 | 0.54 | -- | 0.71 | 36.9 | 14.8 |
| Literates + Primary | 100.01 | 1.52 | 38.57 | 1.27 | 10.3 | 3.88 | 44.30 | 0.17 |
| Middle + Higher Secondary | 100.01 | 0.25 | 11.38 | 2.49 | 29.88 | 16.66 | 39.31 | 0.04 |
| Total | 100.01 | 0.87 | 21.32 | 4.63 | 21.07 | 11.95 | 38.39 | 1.78 |

industrial labour, whereas among the interstate migrants a much less proportion supplies industrial labour; more of interstate migrants came to MUA in trade and commerce and white collar job like 'administrative executive' type jobs.

Therefore, from the educational and occupation characteristics it appears that while educationally the inter-district and interstate migrants appear to be by and large homogeneous, occupationally their response to the growth of economic activities in MUA might not have been similar.

Summary of characteristics

1. Most male migrants came to MC and STs in search of job.

2. Majority of male migrants in MC are significantly associated with 'trade and commerce' and 'transport, storage and communication', i.e., tertiary activities.

3. Majority of the male migrants in STs are associated with 'manufacturing' activity and 'other services'.

The points 2 and 3 suggest that perhaps migrants responded to the patterns of urbanisation in MC and STs. Since the patterns of urbanisation are different in these places, the migrant characteristics, in these places, are also different.

4. Educationally most migrants in MUA are in the 'literate and above' category.

5. Occupationally migrants are broadly associated with 'production' work and 'sales and service' work. But the supply of production labour is more from the migrants within the state whereas the migrants from other states are prone to supply labour in tertiary activities. 'Manufacturing' and 'trade and commerce' activities show dominance in MUA as expected.

The points 4 and 5 do not tell us much about the characteristics of migrants and their response to the pattern of urbanisation in MC and STs because separate migrans' characteristics in these places are not available.

However, the characteristics of the migrants in MC and the STs could not be quite clearly brought out from the Census data. We cannot yet say definitely if the characteristics of the migrants in the two places are different. Given the somewhat different nature of urbanisation, the hypothesis that the stream of migrants in MC differs from the stream of migrants in the STs remains to be tested.

VI

## Concluding Observations

We attempted to describe the census data, mainly of 1971 census, in the light of the nature of urbanisation in MC and the STs. Broad questions under examination were:

(i) If the inmigration to MC and the STs has any relationship with the nature of urbanisation in the respective places;

(ii) In view of the fact that there were possibly different kinds of urbanisation in MC and the STs, do the migrants in one place differ from those in the other.

In relation to the first question more specific questions we intended to examine were:

(i) What was the extent of migration into MC and the STs in 1971?

(ii) What was the extent of migration into MC, over time, i.e., in different periods with different nature of urbanisation?

(iii) How far the kind of urbanisation in MC and the STs stretched its influence across space in generating a pattern of migration?

In relation to the second question we examined the following specific questions:

(iv) What are the migrant characteristics in terms of working and dependant migrants?

(v) With what kind of economic activities in MC and the STs the working migrants are associated?

(vi) What are the educational and occupational characteristics of the migrants?

Findings

We found that the extent of migration, according to 1971 census data, is much higher in MC than in the STs. The intertemporal analysis of the extent of migration into MC suggests that it was stagnant when the employment prospect in 'manufacturing', 'trade and commerce' and 'transport etc' activities showed a decline; it increased during the rapid industrialisation in MC; and it declined sharply despite an increase in employment prospect in the 'manufacturing', 'trade and commerce' and 'transport etc' activities, in MC. This could be due to a shift away of industrial investment to the STs. After 1951, there was a decline in the rate of inmigration to MC, when the STs industrialised.

It is difficult to conclude from the above if inmigration to MC was clearly related to the employment opportunity created by 'manufacturing' growth (or industrialisation in general) in MC and the STs. The hypothesis of positive association between inmigration and industrialisation at a place remains to be tested with the help of elaborate field data.

As for the pattern of migration generated by the nature of urbanisation in MUA, it appears that the influence of urbanisation did not quite go far beyond the neighbouring districts of MUA and the neighbouring states of Tamil Nadu. What is important, however, is that there was a substantial dose of intra-agglomeration migration; of them 10 times as

many migrants came from MC to the STs as those from the STs to MC. That is, MC has pushed out a large number of people to the STs. In view of urbanisation of the STs through industrialisation, the flow of migrants from MC to the STs indicates again the question if industrialisation at a place generates inmigration. However, the migration from MC to the STs could partly be explained by the suburbanisation influence of MC.

As for the nature of migration, we indicated the possible existence of multistep and return migration. In this regard we do not have any conclusive evidence. But an elaborate study of such nature of migration is required, because it may throw light on the decision process of migration - whether such step or return migration is due to planned moves, or due to footlooseness of the migrants and constant revision of the migration decision.

The worker and nonworker characteristics of the migrants show that while most female migrants in MC and the STs are dependants, most male migrants are workers. But among the intra-agglomeration male migrants the percentage of workers to total migrants is very low (about 52 per cent as compared to those who came to MC and the STs from outside (65 per cent or more)). Another interesting point is that the more of the rural male migrants came to MUA for work than did the urban male migrants. In view of the high percentage of workers among the male migrants, there is a possibility of push factor being at play along with the pull exerted by industrialisation. The push and the pull factors cannot be identified with the help of census data.

The association of the migrant workers with census ninefold industrial classification suggests that in MC there is a heavy concentration of migrants in tertiary (particularly 'trade and commerce') activities than in the 'manufacturing' activity. In contrast, the resident population have tended to corner the 'manufacturing' sector employment. Perhaps

migrants came to MC in response to the growth of industrial employment opportunity, but being competed away by the resident workers joined the tertiary sector. In effect there could be nonhomogeneous labour market of resident and migrant workers /Deshpande (1979), Joshi and Joshi (1976)/.

Association of the migrant workers and the industrial activities in the STs suggest a heavy concentration of the migrant workers in the 'manufacturing' activity. But whether this is the result of industrialisation of the STs is yet to be examined. Lacking time series data of the migrant workers' distribution across the economic activities held us from concluding about the process of urbanisation and inmigration.

Educational characteristics of the migrants were analysed for MUA as a whole. Most migrants are literate but they do not have very high formal educational levels, or particular skill.

Occupational characteristics of the migrant workers are also analysed for MUA as a whole. Majority of the migrant workers are found in occupational categories, such as 'production and related workers', and 'sales and service workers'. A few are in 'clerical workers' category.

The educational and occupational characteristics of the migrants are provided for MUA alone. Disaggregation of the data for MUA into MC and the STs is not possible (see Appendix I). This has held us from getting an insight of the characteristics of the migrants in MC and the STs. As a result we could not examine if the stream of migrants in MC differs from the stream of migrants in the STs.

As for the migration from MC to the STs we presume that the process had started with industrialisation. This might indicate that the migrants responded to the employment opportunity created in the STs. But the flow of migrants

from MC to the STs could arise partly due to the shift of residence from MC to STs. This may reflect a process of suburbanisation of the agglomeration. An indirect evidence that this set of migrants has a very low male workers' participation rate and a high sex ratio (indicating a high degree of familial migration, see Appendix II) indicates a possibility of suburbanisation. However, it requires a further test if the migration from MC to the STs is related to the process of industrialisation in the STs or to the suburbanisation process. If both are present, to what extent industrialisation and suburbanisation have drawn migrants from MC to the STs.

## Appendix - I

### Data

In this paper we have extensively used the migration data available from the census 1971. For an intertemporal analysis of net inmigration to Madras city we shall make use of the data since 1901 that are available for the city. Owing to the lack of data the analysis of migration into the satellite towns is confined to the 1971 census migration data alone.[1]

There is a problem of comparability of the migration data across the census years owing to the changes in the definition of migrants. We shall, therefore, begin by presenting the definitions of migrants and their possible implications for identifying the migrants in the census years. Thereafter, we shall describe the available migration data of 1971 census with a critical assessment of them.

### Definition of Migrants, 1901-61

Till the census year 1961 migrants were identified as those who were enumerated at a place outside their place of birth. That is, they were migrants by the place of birth (POB) concept. This definition includes those migrants also who have not decided on their own to migrate. For example, as Kingsley Davis writes, "Hindu wives, ...., usually return to their parent's home for the first confinement; if this happens to be a few miles across a provincial or district boundary, the child becomes an 'inmigrants' at the next census".[2] That is, migrants' origin does not refer to a normal place of residence. Also, as a child the person is not an 'active' migrant. Again between the place of enumeration (POE) and the POB, if a person has taken a number

---

1. See footnote 1, p.1
2. Census of India, 1961, Special Migration Tables, Madras City, Vol.IX Part X-(II), p.III.

of moves this multistep migration will not be accounted for by the POB concept. Also, if a person had moved to other places and returned to the POB, he (she) will not be considered as a return migrant. Therefore, the multistep as well as return migrants (to the POB) are missed out by the POB concept.

In short, the POB concept of migration is likely to have the following two limitations:

(i) It includes, partly, the 'inactive' migrants such as newly born babies.

(ii) It misses out step and return migrants.

Definition of Migrants, 1971[3]

Considering the second limitation above, 1971 census provides migration data based on the previous place of last residence (PLR) concept, though at an aggregate level there is only one table suggesting the number of migrants by their POB. In the PLR concept, a person was identified as a migrant if a person at the present place of enumeration came from another place of normal residence irrespective of his place of birth. "Even if a person were born at the place of enumeration, and if by the nature of his work or for studies etc. he had shifted subsequently to another village/town and had come back again to the POE, he should be deemed to have had another place of residence prior to his enumeration in the place."[4] Therefore, the PLR concept includes, (a) the

---

3. 1971 census migration tables are yet to be published. We obtained the data either from the manuscripts, or from the proof reading level printing.

4. Census 1971 removed a possible ambuguity of short term last residences. It says, "The last previous residence is relevant only if he had been outside the village or town of enumeration and not simply in another house or locality in the same place,... Where a person had merely gone out to another place or had been shifting from place to place purely on tour or pilgrimage or for temporary business purposes,

contd....

migrants by POB concept, (b) the step migrants, and (c) the return migrants. The number of migrants counted following the PLR concept will be greater than the number by POB concept, as is obvious.

A comparison of the definition of migrants in 1971 with that of previous censuses suggests that the PLR concept captures step and return migrants over and above the migrants by place of birth concept (presumably single step migrants). In this sense, 1971 census definition has a wider coverage of migrants than the previous censuses had. However, in neither concept, the child or 'inactive' migrants are excluded.

Census data on migration are obtained on the basis of 10 per cent sample of the rural population, and 20 per cent sample of the urban population. The data are presented in the Migration Tables D-Series of Census 1971.

Nature of Migration Data in Census 1971

1971 Census Migration Tables DI through DVI show the distribution of migrants, from various places of last residence, by their socio-economic and other characteristics. A description of the data of DI-DVI is presented in Table I.1.

It can be seen from the table that only the Census Migration Table DI presents population of MUA by their place of birth, and the Census Tables DII-DVI provide data on the migrants by their place of last residence (col.2, Table I.1).

---

Foot Note 4 contd.

he should not be deemed to have had another residence different from the place where he his family normally resides, but if his normal home had been elsewhere anytime before he is enumerated at his place of present residence, irrespective of where he was born, such place of his previous residence should be recorded. See, Census of India, 'Introductory Notes', Migration Tables D Series, 1971.

I.1 Nature of 1971 Census Migration Data and their Possible use

| Census Migration Tables (1) | Data on Migrants (2) | Place of Enumeration (3) | Nature of data (4) | Place of Birth/ Last Residence (5) | Rural/Urban areas of last residence (6) | Remarks (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D I | Population | MUA only | Population by place of birth | Place of birth<br>(a) Outside India<br>(b) In other States of India beyond Tamilnadu<br>(c) In other districts beyond MUA,<br>(d) within MUA | Both rural and urban break down available. | Data suggest migration by POB concept by using (a), (b) and (c) but restricted only to MUA as a whole. No seperate estimate is obtainable for MC and STs. |
| D II | Migrants | MC only | Duration of residence in the place of enumeration prior to 1971. | Place of Last residence<br>(a) Outside India (b) In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu (c) In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA - No data for migrants within MUA but outside MC. | Rural and Urban break up available. | Duration of residence in the POE, prior to 1971, helps us understand as to how many years before 1971 the migrants entered MC. Non-availability of MUA data restricts us from periodising the migrants entry into STs. |
| D III | Migrants | MUA only | Migrants' broad age group, occupational and educational Characteristics. | (a) (b) (c) available<br>(d) not available | Rural/Urban distinction missing. | A set of socio-economic characteristics such as occupational/ educational characteristics are available in this table. But these characteristics of the migrants cannot be analysed for MC & STs, separately. These characteristics for R/U migrants will also be missing. |

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Hence these characteristics are analysed for all the migrants in MUA as a whole from (a), (b) and (c) only. |
| D IV | Migrants | MUA only | Migrants by broad duration of stay in the place of last residence (i.e. duration of stay 3 yrs. or less and 3 yrs or more) | (a) available (b) available (c) available (d) not available | Available by Rural/ Urban areas | Not a very useful table. The duration of stay at the last residence without any reference to a point of time does not suggest when the migrants left the place of last residence. Hence it is difficult to find usefulness of the data. |
| App. to D IV | Migrants | MC and STs of MUA | same as D IV | MC and STs | Available only for urban area only | Very useful table in understanding the intraagglomeration migration flow i.e., from MC to STs, and STs to MC. |
| D V | Migrants | MUA and MC | Workers and non-workers. Distribution of workers into 9 fold industrial categories. | (a) (b) (c) (d) available for MUA and (a) (b) (c) are available for MC .(d) is not required for MC | Rural/ Urban break up available. | This table shows the industrial districts of the migrant workforce. This is a very useful table, for all the relevant dis-aggregations of PLR are available. It helps in understanding the workforce participation rates, workers association with specific industry across various places of last residence.etc., |
| D VI | Migrants | MUA and MC | Age groups, duration of stay at last residence (less than 1 yr., 1-9 yrs, 10 yrs or more), and marital status. | (a) (b) (c) (d) available for MUA and (a)(b). (c) are available for MC | Break up by Rural/Urban areas for MUA. available Rural/Urban distinction missing for MC data. | 1. Again the duration of stay in the place of last residence is not a useful data. But marital status of the migrants helps us understand the mode of migration such as familial or single migration etc. 2. Because MC does not have Rural/Urban distinction isolation of STs data from MUA by Rural/Urban areas is not possible. |

Column 3 of Table I.1 shows the level of disaggration at which migration data are available, i.e., it shows if the migration data are available for only MUA or MC or both. Column 4 shows various characteristics across which the migrants are distributed. Places of last residence are shown in column 5; and a further break down of the places of last residence into rural and urban areas is shown in column 6. Finally, column 7 of Table I.1 shows the use of the data available in DI-DVI.

A note on the usefulness of the information in col. 3 (Table I.1) is required here. Wherever the migration data are available for only MC, our analysis is obviously confined to the city alone. Analysis is confined to only MUA whenever data are available for the whole of the urban agglomeration alone. In the case of availability of data for both MUA and MC we have been able to separate the data for STs by subtracting the slements of MC from the corresponding elements of MUA. This has been, however, possible only in the case of Census Migration Tables DV and DVI.

We may now present a brief account of the use of the data available from census 1971. First, the number of migrants from different places of last residence, such as outside India, other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu, other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA and within the district,[5] suggests the patterns of migration into MUA. These patterns are indicated, respectively, as international, interstate, interdistrict and intra-agglomeration migration (Sec. III). The rural/urban breakdown of the data suggests rural-urban and urbab-urban pattern of migration. For each of the above patterns of migration we have analysed the socio-economic and other characteristics of the migrants (shown in col.4 Table I.1). Such analysis has been done separately for MC and STs wherever possible.

---

5. Last residence within the district implies the previous residence within MUA, i.e., in MC or in STs.

A Few Remarks in the 1971 Census Migration Tables

The census Migration Tables of 1971 are yet to be published. Some of the D-Series tables are in the manufscript form and some are at the proof level. We suspect the data will not be published in the near future, because there is a clear lack of uniformity and consistency of presentation of the data. We shall cite these problems below.

First, there is no uniformity of the level at which data are presented. Column 3 of our table (I.1) shows that data are available sometimes for only MUA, sometimes for MC alone and sometimes for both. In case the data were available for both MC and MUA we could have derived the data for STs. This would help us analyse the characteristics of the migrants in MC and STs which we presumed would differ across space. But the lack of uniformity of the level of disaggregation of the data has prevented us from doing so, especially in the case of the data arising from the Tables DII and DIII.

Secondly, the data by the places of last residence are not presented uniformly. The migrants' last residence from within the agglomeration is missing in many of the tables, e.g., DIII, DIV. Again the rural/urban disaggregation of the last residence is not uniform across the Census Migration Tables (see col. 6, Table I.1). This kind of nonuniformity has severely restricted a meaningful analysis of the census data. For instance, we know from D-V how the rural/urban migrants are associated with the industrial activities in MC and STs. If we wanted to study the occupational characteristics and educational levels of the same rural/urban migrants in MC and STs from D-III, we were unable to do so, because D-III shows neither rural/urban break up nor the possibility of MC/STs break up. That is, the level of disaggregation of last residence as available in D V is not available in D III. Columns 5 and 6 may show clearly such nonuniformities across census Migration Tables.

Finally, the estimates of the total number of migrants differ across the census Migration Tables. These estimates are presented in Table I.2 below.

Table I.2: Estimates of Total Migrants in MUA/MC Across Different Census Migration Tables, 1971

| Census Migration Tables | MUA | MC |
|---|---|---|
| D II | -- | 7,86,545 |
| D III | 6,03,945 (7,59,655) | --- |
| D IV | 11,26,315 | --- |
| D V | 11,63,810 | 7,86,545 |
| D VI | 11,63,810 | 7,86,545 |

The table shows that estimates of the total migrants in MUA are not identical across D-Series Migration Tables of Census 1971. What is glaring is the different of the estimate of D III with the other tables. It shows also that the total number of migrants in MUA according to D III is even less than the total number of migrants in MC which is an impossibility. From Table I.1 it is clear that D III does not include the intra-agglomeration migrants numbering 1,55,710. Even if we add these intra-agglomeration migrants to the total migrants of MUA in D III the total number of migrants in MUA, as shown in the paranthesis, does not exceed that in MC. There appears to be a serious problem of data compilation by the directorate of Census Operations, Tamil Nadu.

Summing up

We have observed above that the census migration data of 1971 show an improvement over those of 1961 and before. The PLR concept is likely to capture step and return migrants over and above those by the place of birth concept. But the presentation of the 1971 data does not follow a unique pattern in terms of level of disaggregation of the place of enumeration (MUA/MC) and the level of disaggregation of the last residences. The estimate of the number of migrants in MUA according to the Migration Table DIII is doubtful.

## Appendix - II

### Mode of Migration

We shall describe here as to how the migrants came to MC and the STs, or to what extent the migrants, from various places of last residence, came to MUA in singles or with their families. We shall attempt to answer the question from the behaviour of the sex ratio, measured as the number of female per thousand male migrants, across various patterns of migration. In the case of MC we shall analyse the mode of migration over time as well.

The sex ratios of the migrants indirectly indicate the difference between the number of male and female in a given set of migrants. Lower this difference higher is the sex ratio. High sex ratio implies that the number of female closely corresponds to the number of male. It is possible that the male and female migrants move in family units following which the sex ratio tends to be very high, close to 1,000. If we assume that by and large the females do not decide on their own to migrate, but the males do, then high sex ratio is a reflection of familial migration, whereas the low sex ratio is a reflection of migration by males in singles.

We shall use the data available from the Migration Tables D II, D V and D VI of census 1971. Data available from these tables are shown in Appendix-I (Table I.1). The table D VI provides data on the migrants by their marital status and the age groups, for each place of last residence. The marital status of the migrants of both sexes is given in three groups, viz., 'never married', 'married' and 'widowed and divorced'. This detail may throw some light on the process of migration. Unfortunately, table D VI does not provide data on migrants in MC by their rural and urban last residences. Though the rural/urban disaggregation is available for MUA the lack of it for MC prevents us from obtaining the

number of migrants in the STs from rural and urban last residences for different marital statuses. Hence we shall consider, in what follows, the migrants total from rural and urban areas of each place of last residence, as and when we use the table D VI.

Modes of Migration into MC According to Marital Statuses

We shall examine here if high sex ratios are found among those who are likely to migrate in family units, especially among the married and child migrants. If that happens to be true, high sex ratio will be a proper indicator of familiar migration. The sex ratios of the migrants in MC from various places of last residence and with different marital statuses are presented in Table II.1. The table shows varying extent of familial migration among the 'married', 'never married' and 'widowed and divorced'[1] migrants depending upon the sex ratios; with the possibility that higher sex ratio is associated with higher extent of familial migration.

Table II.1 shows that among the 'married' migrants (col.2) the sex ratios are very high, close to 1000, especially for the dominant patterns in MC, like interstate and interdistrict migration. They show a high extent of familial migration in this category of migrants.[2] The average sex

---------

1. The sex ratios of the 'widowed and divorced' migrants are abnormally high. This need not mean a very high extent of familial migration in this special category of migrants. Often the 'widowed and divorced' women move away from the place of last residence where they were living with their husbands whereas men need not do so under the similar circumstances. Hence a very high sex ratio among the 'wodowed and divorced' migrants, which is likely to be associated with single migration by females. However, the number of migrants in this category being too small does not influence the overall familial migration into MC.

2. See next page.

ratios of the migrants of all statuses (col.5) are very close to the ones obtained for the 'married' migrants. This implies that there is a heavy concentration of the number of migrants in this category as compared to 'never married' and the 'widowed and divorced' migrants. That is, by and large familial migration is the most significant mode of migration in MC.

The sex ratios of the 'never married' migrants show a low extent of familial migration, or a high extent of single migration by males (col. 3, Table II.1). But this need not be true of the 'never married' child migrants. While children

Table II.1: Sex-Ratios (Number of Female per 1000 male) of Migrants of Various Marital Statuses in MC, in 1971, from Various Places of Last Residence

| Marital Status / Last Residence (1) | Married (2) | Never Married (3) | Widowed & Divorced (4) | Total (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 816 | 691 | 4213 | 838 |
| In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 934 | 469 | 4369 | 784 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 925 | 460 | 5087 | 844 |
| Total in MC | 924 | 472 | 4904 | 828 |

---

2. High sex ratio among the 'married' migrants may imply two processes of familial migration. One is that the married males move with their wives. The other possibility is that the married women migrate to join their husbands, the residents of MC, while males (married) actually migrate in singles. Both these processes can be present, but with the Census data we cannot determine the actual extent of each of these processes. Since, however, both imply the process of familial migration in some way we shall retain this as the general process associated with high sex ratio.

are likely to move with their family unmarried older migrants may move in singles. In order to identify this we have presented the 'never married' migrants across age groups, and their sex ratios in Table II.2.

Table II.2 Distribution of 'Never Married' Migrants and their Sex Ratios by Age Groups in MC, 1971

| Age Groups (years) | Male | Female | Sex Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 14 | 53,680<br>(29.88) | 50,395<br>(59.45) | 939 |
| 15 - 19 | 33,435<br>(18.61) | 18,950<br>(22.36) | 567 |
| 20 - 24 | 53,265<br>(29.65) | 10,375<br>(12.24) | 195 |
| 25 - 49 | 37,865<br>(21.08) | 4,655<br>(5.49) | 123 |
| 50 years & above | 1,420<br>(0.79) | 390<br>(0.46) | 275 |
| Total | 1,79,665<br>(100.01) | 84,765<br>(100.00) | 472 |

*(Source: Migration Table D VI of Census 1971)

It is clear from Table II.2 that the 'never married' child migrants in the age group 0-14 years have moved into MC in family units, as indicated by a high sex ratio of 939. Beyond this age group, the sex ratio falls rather sharply, implying that most of the 'never married' young males (above 15 years) migrated to MC in singles. This category of single male migrants in the age group above 15 years form about 70 per cent of the total 'never married' male migrants. The rest of the unmarried male migrants in 0-14 age groups together with the 'married' male migrants (see Table II.1) all assumed to have migrated in family units, is likely to outweigh the influence of single migration, and form the dominant mode as familial migration into MC.

From the above analysis we can say, in short, that the significant mode of migration into MC is a familial one.

The analysis above suggests the positive association between the sex ratio and the extent of familial migration (negative association with single migration). In order to establish this broad association we brought in the marital characteristics of the migrants to examine if the high sex ratios are found among those migrants who are likely to move with their family. Census data confirm that high sex ratios are associated with 'married' and child migrants, which in turn confirms that high sex ratio is associated with familial migration. For the emphasis on this relationship we have not analysed the sex ratios across patterns of migration. Another reason is that the sex ratios across marital characteristics are not available for rural and urban last residences, so we have postponed the analysis across patterns, which we intend to take up now.

## Mode of Migration into MC-Comparison Across Patterns

For the comparison of modes across patterns we shall use the data available from the Migration Table D V of Census 1971. The sex ratios obtained from the data of D V are presented, according to rural and urban areas of last residence, in Table II.3.

Comparison of sex ratio across the most significant patterns of migration into MC, viz., the interdistrict and interstate patterns, indicates that the extent of familial migration is higher for interdistrict than for interstate patterns, both for rural as well as urban migrants. Two possible factors for differential extent of familial migration may be cited. One important reason is that since the migrants came to MC from contiguous districts and states,[3] the distance

---

3. See Section III 'Patterns of Migration into MC'.

travelled in migrating from these districts is less than that from the contiguous states, and the cost of migration is less in the former than in the latter case. The cost, proportional to distance, might have regulated the extent of familial migration across these patterns. Another factor may be that the difference in socio-economic environment across states is greater than that across districts, hence a lower extent of familial migration in the interstate pattern than in the interdistrict patterns.

Comparison of sex ratios between the rural and urban areas of the two dominant patterns above shows that urban-MC migration has higher extent of familial migration than the rural-MC migration. This could again be due to the socio-economic differences characterising the rural and urban areas of the last residences. As for economic cost for distant migration we do not know whether the rural areas are at greater distance from MC than the urban areas, hence we do not venture any explanation relating to economic cost.

Table II.3 Sex Ratios (No. of Female per 1000 Male) of Migrants in MC, in 1971, by Rural and Urban Last Residence

| Last Residence | Total | Rural | Urban |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 834 | -- | -- |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 784 | 698 | 835 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 844 | 792 | 908 |
| In STs | 1287 | -- | 1287 |
| Total in MC | 834 | 773 | 895 |

Thus Table II.3 provides a comparative picture of the extent of familial (or single) migration into MC across the two significant patterns of migration which can be summarised as:

1. Interdistrict migration has higher extent of familial migration than the interstate migration has.

2. Urban-MC migration is more familial than the rural-MC migration.

Both these observations suggest a general mode that greater the cost of migration and the difference in socio-economic environment across space lower will be the extent of familial migration. These obstacles are likely to generate larger single migration among male. If the single male migrants have crossed these hurdles we shall expect that they have done so under economic necessity and will look for employment opportunity in MC. In other words, it requires to be tested if lower extent of familial migration is associated with higher extent of employment or higher extent of workers' participation among male.*

We shall now turn to the question of mode of migration over time. We shall attempt to answer as to what has been the process of migration prior to 1971, in relation to the extent of migration that was taking place in MC.

## Mode of Migration into MC, over time

We shall use the data available from the Migration Table DII of Census 1971 which gives the distribution of male and female migrants from rural and urban areas of the last residences by their duration of stay in MC. These data suggest at which periods, prior to 1971, had the migrants entered MC, and constituted the stock in 1971. This follows from the fact that longer the duration of stay in MC earlier is the period of entry, relative to 1971, into MC.

*See Section V, Table 10, which shows that the WPRs of the rural migrants are greater than those of the urban migrants, and this is in inverse relation with the summary point 2 of Table II.3.

The sex ratios of the migrants of different durations of stay in MC are presented, across the rural and urban areas of the last residence, in Table II.4. In the column of duration of stay at the place of enumeration, i.e., in MC, we have presented the approximate calender periods tracing back from the year 1971, which would correspond to the duration of stay in MC.

It can be seen from Table II.4 that for almost all the patterns of migration the sex ratios of the migrants, who came to MC before 1952, are very low. The sex ratios improved for those who came later than 1952. This implies that there was lower extent of familial migration prior to 1952. What are the reasons for such a low extent of familial migration before 1952? Is it because people migrated owing to economic distress at the place of last residence and could not bear the cost of familial migration, or is it because women were not quite mobile and hence a low sex ratio? The analysis of Census report of 1961 shows that prior to 1951 the sex ratios of the migrants were quite high which invalidates the questions of economic distress or immobility of women across space.[4] Perhaps, census data do not permit us to explore the question further.

However, the sex ratios have improved among those who migrated to MC after 1952, but continued to decline after 1952-62 period, both among rural migrants (col.5) and urban migrants (col.8) as well as among the total migrants (col.9).

The sex ratio of the rural migrants from other states fluctuated over time, while that of rural interdistrict migrants declined persistently after the period 1952-62. On the whole the sex ratio declined for all rural-MC migrants.

---

4. Sex Ratio

| 1901 | 1911 | 1921 | 1931 | 1941 | 1951 | 1961 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 891 | 849 | 754 | 784 | -- | 814 | 843 |

Table II.4 Sex Ratio of the Migrants in MC, Over Time, From Different Places of Last Residence

| Last Residence / Duration of Stay at the Place of Enumeration | Outside India | Rural | | | Urban | | | Total in MC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | Total | In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | In other districts of Tamil Nady beyond MUA | Total | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| 20 years or more (In or Before 1952) | 827 | 598 | 691 | 675 | 792 | 817 | 809 | 736 |
| 10 - 19 years (1952-1962) | 720 | 732 | 920 | 842 | 859 | 954 | 921 | 879 |
| 5 - 9 years (1962-67) | 901 | 698 | 865 | 827 | 837 | 948 | 908 | 872 |
| 1 - 4 years (1967-70) | 855 | 771 | 765 | 767 | 826 | 904 | 876 | 825 |
| Less than 1 year (1970-71) | 485 | 365 | 735 | 712 | 784 | 948 | 876 | 788 |
| Total | 837 | 698 | 810 | 773 | 835 | 908 | 882 | 822 |

As for the migrants from the urban areas of other states and of the districts of Tamil Nadu, the sex ratio declined persistently, after 1952-62 period, for those from other states and fluctuated for those from other districts of Tamil Nadu. On the whole, the sex ratio of all urban migrants declined.

It is clear from the above observations that the extent of familial migration into MC has gradually declined after the period 1952-62. In view of the fact that MC is gradually becoming saturated in its capacity to contain population or migrants[5] the declining familial migration is an expected result. Because of saturation, MC has become unattractive to migrants, perhaps, in terms of difficult housing or employment situation. This might have resulted in a larger extent of single migration of male into MC. The high extent of familial migration from MC to STs at different periods of time might have also resulted in a low sex ratio among the migrants in MC.[6]

The comparison of sex ratios across interstate and inter-district migration shows that the latter is always more familial than the former. This is true for rural as well as for the urban migrants (compare cols 3 and 4, and 6 and 7). Also between rural and urban migrants, urban-MC migration is more familial than rural-MC migration. That is, the socio-economic differences between MC and the place of last residence has influenced the extent of familial or single migration over time also.

The important single observation from the above analysis is that the extent of familial migration into MC has declined over time, especially after the period 1952-62. This could be

---

5. See Section II

6. See Mode of Migration into STs in this section. If the shift away of migrants from MC to STs has reduced the sex ratio, it will imply that those who went to STs came to MC in the previous step. (See Section IV also).

due to unattractiveness of MC to the migrants and high extent of familial migration from MC to STs.

The modes of migration into MC can be summarised as the following:

1. Interdistrict migration is more familial than inter-state migration.

2. Urban-MC migration is more familial than rural-MC migration.

3. The extent of familial migration into MC has been declining since the period 1952-62.

## Modes of Migration into STs

We shall now consider the modes of migration into STs across marital statuses of the migrants and across various patterns of migration. Owing to the lack of data on the duration of stay at the place of enumeration, the mode of migration over time cannot be analysed.

### Mode Among the Migrants into STs by Their Marital Statuses

As in MC, here also we shall examine if the high sex ratio is associated with those who are likely to migrate with their family. The sex ratios of the migrants into STs, from various places of last residence, by their marital statuses are presented in Table II.5.

It is clear from table II.5 that the extent of familial migration is very high among the 'married' migrants, as in the case of MC.[7] The average sex ratios of the migrants from

---

7. We shall not analyse the case of 'widowed and divorced' migrants' mode of migration. Very few migrants are in this category and will not alter the broad conclusion. Otherwise the explanations follow as in the case of mode of migration in this category of migrants into MC. As long as there is similarity with modes of migration into MC we shall not analyse the case of STs in detail.

all marital statuses, for the given patterns of migration, are influenced by the sex ratio among the 'married' migrants (see Col.5). This implies that the majority of migrants in STs fall in the 'married' category and provides higher weightage towards its own sex ratios. That is overall mode of migration into STs is a familial one.

Compared to the 'married' migrants, in the 'never married' migrants category the extent of familial migration is very low (col.3, Table II.5). But among the 'never married' child migrants of 0-14 years age group the extent of familial migration is high and among the relatively older

Table II.5* Sex Ratio (No. Female per 1000 Male) of Migrants in STs, in 1971, from Various Places of Last Residence Across Marital Statuses

| Last Residence \ Marital Status (1) | 'Married' (2) | 'Never Married' (3) | Widowed & Divorced (4) | Total (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | 753 | 710 | 2741 | 794 |
| In other States of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 815 | 444 | 4329 | 678 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 1185 | 532 | 6517 | 978 |
| Total in STs | 1060 | 512 | 5828 | 883 |

*Source D VI (Figures in the last row do not include Intra-agglomeration migrants).

migrants (beyond the age group 0-14 years) there is a high extent of single migration, as indicated by declining sex ratio across age groups (Table II.6).

Table II.6* Distribution of 'Never Married' Migrants by Sex and Age Groups in the STs and Their Sex Ratios, 1971

| Age Group (years) | Male | Female | Sex Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 14 | 46,245 | 43,900 | 949 |
| 15 - 19 | 15,875 | 10,100 | 636 |
| 20 - 24 | 19,760 | 3,690 | 187 |
| 25 - 49 | 13,095 | 1,305 | 100 |
| 50 years & above | 385 | 180 | 468 |
| Total | 95,360 | 59,175 | 620 |

*(Source: Migration Table D VI of Census 1971)

It is clear from Table II.6 that a substantial number of 'never married' migrants fall in the age group 0-14. This added with the 'married' migrants will form the most significant mode of migration into STs as the familial one. All these conform to the analysis of mode of migration into MC.

The above analysis point to the fact that there is a high extent of familial migration among the migrants in STs, and the sex ratios are high among those who are likely to migrate with their family.

## Modes Across Patterns of Migration into STs

The sex ratios of the migrants in STs from rural and urban last residences are presented in Table II.7. The table shows that the general mode of migration for interdistrict and intra-agglomeration patterns, the most significant ones, is one of familial type and intra-agglomeration migration

Table II.7* Sex Ratios of the Migrants in STs, in 1971 from Rural and Urban Last Residences

| Last Residence (1) | Rural (2) | Urban (3) | Total (4) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outside India | -- | -- | 794 |
| In other states of India beyond Tamil Nadu | 719 | 684 | 695 |
| In other districts of Tamil Nadu beyond MUA | 1088 | 796 | 977 |
| In MC | -- | 1053 | 1053 |
| Total in STs | 1018 | 920 | 949 |

*(Source: Migration Table D V of Census 1971)

pattern has greater extent of familial migration than inter-district pattern (col.4). Compared to a relatively insignificant patterns, i.e., the interstate pattern, the inter-district migration has a greater extent of familial pattern. We assume that, as in MC, the migrants in STs came from contiguous districts and states, and have travelled longer distance in the interstate pattern than in the interdistrict pattern, and of course the intra-agglomeration migrants have travelled the least distance. Then the economic cost of distant migration and socio-economic difference across space appear to have regulated the extent of familial migration. However, the relationship between the extent of familial migration and the economic cost and socio-economic environmental difference across space needs to be investigated in greater detail. We can at best call it a hypothesis which cannot be tested with the census data, because the census data do not provide the socio-economic characteristics of migrants at the last residence.

Comparison of sex ratios between rural and urban migrants shows that rural-STs pattern has greater extent of familial migration than the urban-STs pattern. Does this mean that the difference in socio-economic conditions between rural areas and STs is much less than that between urban areas of other districts or states and the STs,* such that rural-STs migration is more familial than the urban-STs migration? Or, do the urban-STs migrants travel longer distance than the rural-STs migrants for which the extent of familial migration behaves in this way? Or, is it simply that the rural migrants are always economically well off to venture familial migration, whereas urban migrants from outside MUA are not? Answer to these questions has to await the analysis of field data again because we do not simply have data, on these questions, from the census.

We can, however, summarise the basic tendency of the modes of migration into the STs as:

1. The extent of familial migration is greater among the intra-agglomeration migrants than among the inter-district migrants.

2. In the interdistrict and interstate patterns of migration the extent of familial migration is greater for rural-STs migrants than for the urban-STs migrants.

3. Most significant is the high extent of familial migration among the interdistrict rural-STs and the MC-STs migrants.

<u>Comparison Between the Modes in MC and STs</u>

The comparison of modes of migration for interstate, interdistrict and intra-agglomeration patterns in that

---

*It is possible that the STs are small and urban character is yet to develop beyond Census definition, See Town and Village Directorory, 1971.

order shows increasing extent of familial migration both in MC as well as in the STs. But the extent of familial migration from rural and urban areas show different tendencies in MC and the STs. One distinct difference is that urban-MC migration is more familial than the urban-STs migration, and the rural-MC migration is less familial than rural-STs migration (compare col.4, Table II.3 with col.3 Table II.7 and col.3, Table II.3 with col.2 Table II.7). Differences are quite large sometimes. The other difference is that the extent of familial migration is greater for urban-MC migrants than for rural-MC migrants, whereas the extent of familial migration is greater for rural-STs migrants than for urban-STs migrants. But for the total migrants in STs and MC it appears that the extent of familial migration is higher among all rural and all urban migrants into STs than among the all rural and all urban migrants into MC. We can say that in the aggregate the extent of familial migration is higher among the migrants in STs than among those in MC.

*********

## Bibliography

1. Census of India 1961, Madras City Report, Vol.IX, Part X-(i).

2. Census of India 1961, Special Migration Tables, Madras City, Vol.IX, Part X-(ii).

3. Census of India 1971, Migration Tables, Series D (Unpublished).

4. Connell, John, Das Gupta, Biblab., Laishley, Roy, and Lipton Michael, (1976), Migration From Rural Areas: The Evidence From Village Studies, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

5. Deshpande, L.K., (1979), The Bombay Labour Market, Department of Economics, University of Bombay, Bombay. (Mimeo)

6. Joshi, Heather and Joshi, Vijay., (1976), Surplus Labour and the City : A Study of Bombay, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

7. Kurien, C.T., and Huq,Abdul., (1980), An Analysis of Internal Migration in Tamil Nadu, Working Paper No.12, M.I.D.S. (Mimeo)

8. Kurien, C.T., (1971), 'Problems of Suburbanisation' Madras Development Seminar Series, Vol.I, No.8.

9. Lewandowski, Susan J., (1979), 'Changing Form and Function in the Ceremonial and the Colonial Port City in India: A Historical Analysis of Madurai and Madras' in Chaudhuri, K.N. and Dewey, C.J., (eds.), Economy and Society : Essays in Indian Economic and Social History, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

10. Mitra, Asok., Mukerji, Shekhar and Bose, Ranendranath, (1980), Indian Cities : Their Industrial Structure, Inmigration and Capital Investment 1961-71, Abhinav Publications, New Delhi.

11. Nagaraj, K. and Majumdar, S. (1982), Growth of Madras Urban Agglomeration, Working Paper No.25, M.I.D.S. (Mimeo)